

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 4-9, 12-18 and 21-34 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 19 and 20 were previously cancelled. Claims 1 and 18 are amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action dated October 16, 2008, claims 1, 4-9, 16-18, 25-29 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Loisey et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,999,912 in view of Liu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,898,780. Claims 12, 13, 21, 22, 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Loisey et al. in view of Liu et al. and further in view Goyal et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,976,258.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Certified Copy of the Priority Document

Applicant has filed the certified copy of the priority document with the USPTO.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

All of the claims stand rejected based on Loisey in combination with other references. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The independent claims have been amended to recite the additional aspects relating to how the wrapper mediates the interaction. Specifically, the wrapper establishes the connection using the modified protocol between the client and the server, but the server responds using the original unmodified protocol (e.g., standard FTP, standard HTTP, etc.). Also, the server is the same original server that is not modified to work with any new protocols. Support for the language of the amendments may be found, for example, on page 13 of the specification (“Once the original FTP server is created, it expects to have a communication from the beginning, including the “USER” command, and any prior commands that the user issued.”)

This feature is not disclosed in Loisey, or Loisey in combination with other references. Loisey is silent on the nature of the server responding to the requests, but, as best understood, the server there would have to be modified in some fashion to understand the modified protocol. Here, the server remains unchanged (which is much more efficient and economical), and the wrapper that is needed for the modified protocol is then terminated.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
BARDMESSER LAW GROUP
/GB/

George S. Bardmesser
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,020

Date: February 10, 2009

1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-1191